NEW SHAKESPEAREANA.

VOL. X. AUGUST—OCTOBER, 1911. No. 3.

THE BANKSIDE REFERENCE CANON OF THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS—A PLEA FOR ITS ADOPTION FOR ALL EDITIONS.

We Americans are in the habit of saying that "time is money." We seldom squander it without occasion. Our lavishness is generally in the hope of some return, either in the way of instant pleasure, or remoter but expected benefit. This is true of all sorts of intellectual time-spenders, but of none truer than of the student of literature. For the field is vast, the bounds of a long lifetime are scarcely sufficient for the satisfactory prosecution of a single branch of research; and as the night draws on and the shadows lengthen few of us care to halt in our review of the ripe golden hoards to winnow away mere chaff, or be otherwise wanton spendthrifts of the precious light that remains. To such, even the waste of minutes is an annoyance, unhappily, too often demanded of their patience.

I propose now, in a practical talk to practical fellow-students, to make a plea for a reference canon of the Shakespeare plays, with a uniform system of notation applicable to all critical reprints of the Folio or Quarto texts—and perhaps in making my plea, to vent a little spleen upon a grievance from which most of us have too often suffered, namely, the scantiness and faultiness of existing codes of literary reference. Historian, biographer, essayist, can all bear witness to the weary hours of search, the pages thumbed, the shelves emptied, to verify some phrase, or perchane a single word, which the behest of criticism demands to be accurately rendered. This is especially the case with the Shakespearian student; for if he be not content to take all his knowledge at second hand, if he be not willingly led by the guide—blind or purblind, it may be—whose hand first grasps his own, if he be ever so slightly devoted to that most enticing and exacting of all branches of critical study which deals with textual intricacies, and which spreads out in review all the opulent stores of philological acumen in the search for the one bit needed to fit, mosaic-wise, into the finished work—he is at each moment driven to ran-

sack the original authorities, in whatever form they may be accessible to him.

One of the most helpful and hopeful phases of modern critical science is the steady progress toward supplying truthworthy authorities for this class of study. A century ago the few who realized the need of comparative research among conflicting texts had little more than happy accident to depend upon, according as fate kindly set in their way, or unkindly withheld, some musty folio or wormy quarto, where, in a passage affording a perfect parallelism of sense, lay the very word required to solve a doubt. To-day our shelves are crowded with reprints, aiming at an ever-increasing accuracy of reproduction and collation. The labor of learned associations, the Camden, the Percy, the Early English Text, and the Old and New Shakespeare Societies, has been supplemented by the arduous toil, and too often the material sacrifices, of individuals who, like Arber and Grosart, reproduce the treasures of ancient bookdom, until the most casual investigator of our time is far better equipped off-hand than were the Theobalds and Malones, the Steevens and Giffords, of three or four score years since.

With the abundance of material, a nicer dependence upon selection and an accurate use of it become more and more imperative. The day of slipshod emendation, of silent adaptation ("convey, the wise it call"), and of unauthorized revision, is gone by. The student has not only the indefeasible right, but the increasing opportunity, to follow step by step the process by which a given critical text of Shakespeare is formed, and bear the testimony of his own good judgment to the soundness of the result, or to revert, himself, to the fountain-heads of authority and weigh equalities with judicial severity.

True, some of the most eminent teachers of Shakespeare hold that it is no business of the student-reader to be studious; that the relation between them is necessary that of master and disciple, of preceptor and neophyte, not of guide and co-worker. Leo says of the duty of an editor of an ideally perfect text that "Every passage that has succeeded in establishing its title to respect, either by the agreement of the old editions or of later emendators, should be adopted in the text, without the slightest mention of all the arguments for and against, which have hitherto been bandied about respecting it. The mention of them is not of the least advantage to the public, and does not at all advance the purification of the text." Hudson, peace be with his soul, in his hard-headed, brawny-handed way, lays about him right and left in this wise: "If any one says that common readers, such as at least ninety-nine persons in a hundred are and must be, should have the details and processes of the work put before them, that so they may be enabled to form in-

dependent judgments for themselves;—I say, whoever talks in this way is either under a delusion himself, or else means to delude others. It may flatter common readers to be told that they are just as competent to judge for themselves in these matters as those are who have made a lifelong study of them: but the plain truth is, that such readers must perforce either take the results of deep scholarship on trust, or else not have them at all; and none but a dupe or a quack, or perhaps a compound of the two, would ever think of representing the matter otherwise."

Such utterances alike deny the right and refuse the opportunity of general critical study, by summarily crowding the many who enjoy and seek to understand Shakespeare into the herd of "common readers." Therein lies the fallacy, for the true reader of Shakespeare is rarely of the common classes to whom Hudson addresses himself. The interest to follow the wonder working Magician through the rush and clash of his metaphor, to be lifted up with him toward the unapproachable and descend with him into the deepest depths of the human soul—and the consciousness that, while it is the voice of a god that speaks, it is a voice that makes us co-heirs of its godhood as it in turn shares the infirmities of our manhood—do not belong to the common reader. Shakespeare is not readable in the same way that a morning newspaper or a society novel is. We read him somehow as we do the Bible; with reverence and faith. And it is just here that the dogmatic teachers go astray; they hold that the Shakespearian canon and text are to be regarded with awe, that not one jot or tittle is to be disturbed, overlooking that it is often their own canon, the mundane creation of their own emendatory judgment, that they set up and into the divinity of which they would forbid the scutiny of the common scholar. For we have no Shakespearian canon, coming down to us with all the sanction of centuries of undisturbed completeness, and made, through daily association from earliest chilhood, the occasion of exposition and comment until its phraseology and inmost import become so woven into our lives that it is a recognizable and immutable standard, as is the case with the Bible. We seem to read the Bible without effort or conscious analysis, until we fancy that its truths come home to us of their own force without exegesis or gloss, but we lose sight of the potential traditions of accumulated early associations, that cling around every familiar word and image, and insensibly aid in building up the meaning into a connected whole. We do not pause to recall, if indeed we ever heeded, the fierce dissensions of the scholiasts as to the right or wrong translation of the words or their title even to a place in the sacred text—the sonorous English of King James' revisers is for us the Bible-word, fresh and un-

alterable from the lips of Deity—and its meaning is that which our fathers and mothers gave it. With such traditional and venerable scanctity attaching to a canonical text, it is easy to comprehend the feeling of shrinking pain, the sensation of being, as it were, passive spectators of a sacrilege, with which the masses look upon the late Revised Version. Not even the hands of those who guide the Ark of the Covenant may be put forth to touch it wiht impunity, though it be to steady it.

Not without amusement could we fancy as many Bibles as editors of the text—some with the Apocryphal books, some without, some eclectically made up from both sources—here an important doctrinal passage omitted, there another inserted, as the varying codices might permit or the erratic predilection of the editors suggest—now the Talmudic legends used to elucidate the Scriptures, now the Avesta-Zend or the Koran cited to illustrate the assumed common origin of some dogma or parable; and therewithal the wildest latitude of verbal alteration and structural adaptation, apparently obeying no other criterion than the announcement of the editor that "Moses undoubtedly meant to say and thus," or "Whatever the scribe may have seemed to make Isaiah say, he never could have intended to write nonsense." Imagine our reverence and faith pinned upon a Bible that had undergone successive editings by Warburton, Pope and Johnson, elaborate textual criticism by half a score of Beckets and Zachary Jacksons, and wholesale emendations after the whim of the "Old Corrector" of some Perkins-Collier codex. Might not the common reader who took interest enough in such a text to follow it, endeavor to fathom its problems for himself and weigh probabilities in the balance of his own judgment, even to the extent of rashly venturing now and again on some neat little conjecture of his own?

It is probably too late to hope for the adoption of a Shakespeare text to which the masses may give belief and respect in something the same way they have done to the King James version. Two centuries of editing—God save the mark—have familiarized mankind with the process as far as Shakespeare is concerned, while the absence of such editing for three centuries during which the English language has grown around the Holy Book itself, as it were, thrusting its tendrils into the very substance of it and sucking thence revivifying strength, has made the Bible a thing beyond light change. But is it too late also to hope for Shakespearian canon so firmly fixed and so generally accepted as to make it as rash to foist Edward III. or the Two Noble Kinsmen into the series of plays as it would be to include Maccabees, Tobias or Baruch in some new edition of the Scriptures? If individual whim or reliance upon the application of some abstrusely arbi-

trary test is to determine—from time to time, with varying results according as the old test varies or new tests are devised—what is or is not Shakespeare, may we not look for some edition in the near future with Mucedorus, Faire Em, or Arden of Feversham check by jowl with Timon or Cymbeline—and should we be more tolerant toward such an innovation than our fast tradition forbids us to be to the inclusion in the Sacred Canon of the sublime morality of Jesus, Son of Sirach, or the rich poesy of The Book of Wisdom?

It is evident that a Shakespearian canon of some kind is needed by scholars, and if nothing more can be done—if no Council of Laodicea be practicable—let the consensus of two centuries constrain us to adhere with some show of reverence to the First Folio, with perhaps the addition of Pericles from the Third Folio. A fairly safe canon is found in the First Folio, for Heminge and Condell were something more than accidental editors or interested holders of floating copyrights—they were fellow-actors with Shakespeare, partners with him in his venture of the "Gloabe on the Blancke-side," and presumably as competent as any men then to be found in King James' England to announce what plays were legitimately owned by the Company and received and acted by them and their associates in the firm belief of the Shakespearian authorship and under the sanction of the Shakespearian name. Canon or not, in the strict sense of the term, the 1623 Folio is our only warrant for thirty-six dramatic compositions of the later Elizabethan and early Jacobean age, under the authentication of a competent and legitimately interested authority, which certifices to them as Shakespeare's.

No wonder, then, that this Folio should be the object of special veneration. There is, to the true Shakespearian, a sacredness about every line and letter of that volume. Its punctuation, barbarous and riotous as it is, and its uncouth orthography, too, may often suggest plausible construction of doubtful passages, and its very errors are of value because conveying a clue to the resolution of cruces found otherwhere in the volume and due to the like "iniurious stealthes" of the type-setters. There is, in short, no one book on the student's shelves to which he must oftener have recourse. And, unless he has, as the outcome of long years of patient reading and collation, gotten the volume almost by heart, and acquired the knack of putting his finger readily upon any given passage, I, with all earnestness, venture to say that there is no book of reference extant in which it is harder for him to find his place, unless it be a quarto of one of the plays.

Opportunity to consult the First Folio text has been much facilitated by

means of reprints of more or less accuracy and more or less popular in character. There are at the present time eight accessible reproductions of the whole work, which claim to be in fac-simile, although none of them is absolutely so.

The first attempt was made in 1807, under the editorship of Francis Douce, a genial and painstaking student. Elaborate preparations were made for the work, a special paper being contributed by Whatman with the name of "Shakespeare" and the date "1806" (in some instances "1807") distinctly watermarked. The typographical peculiarities of the original were preserved, even to the errors, as well as was practicable without possessing the identical and badly mixed fonts from which Jaggard and Blount printed their Folio. The title-page with the Droeshout portrait was re-engraved with great care, and so faithfully has the Face been "writ in brasse" that several imperfect copies of the genuine title have been peiced from the Douce reprint. The volume was issued in 1807 by E. & J. Wright, and was heralded as immaculate; but it soon fell into somewhat undeserved disrepute through the laborious effort of William Upcott, of the London Institution, Moorfields, who, at the instigation of the devil and Professor Porson, devoted 143 days of close attention to a minute collation of the reprint with a copy of the First Folio. His purpose would not seem to have been wholly disinterested, for we first find him coyly dallying with the greatly alarmed booksellers, to one of whom, Arch of Cornhill, he parted with his list of 368 errata in exchange for a fresh copy of the "pretended" reprint, and thereafter he is discovered hawking the copy so acquired, with all the errata fairly written with a pen, for six guineas—not, truly, a munificent recompense for his "four months and twenty-three days" of misapplied toil which, as we learn from his note in the corrected volume, ended "Jan. 28, 1809, at three minutes past 12 o'clock." Upcott's copy, with his collations, is in the library of Dr. Furness, in Philadelphia.

As is shown by a later writer in Notes and Queries, only about forty of the errors detected by Upcott have any marked influence upon the text, and of these only half, or less, can be dignified as "readings." The work of which 250 copies were printed, has become almost as infrequent as a genuine First Folio, and, except in the larger libraries, is inaccessible to the common student.

In 1862-64, Mr. Lionel Booth put forth the well-known type-reduction of the 1623 Folio. The Cambridge Editors say of it, "It is probably the most correct reprint ever issued." Equal precautions against error were probably never before taken. Truthworthy report traces up, through Mr.

Sabin, of New York, the assurance of Mr. Booth himself that the proof-sheets had been submitted to the eight best proof-readers in London before they were struck off. The Droeshout portrait, the head ornaments, tail-pieces and initial letters are photo-engraved reductions; the best is simply reprinted, closely imitating most, but not all, of the typographical peculiarities of the original, even to broken letters, "wrong-font" types, "space-up," etc. But there it stops. The form of the reduced square-quarto page, which is broader in proportion than the Folio, and the "face" of the much smaller type, do not suggest the appearance of the original volume.

The claim to accuracy of the Booth reprint is deservedly high. The publishers, in 1864, on issuing the third part containing the Tragedies, announced that no errors had been pointed out that "have not, on examination, proved to have been errors or misconceptions on the part of the critics."* And more than twenty years of crucial study, such as no volume of like size and pretensions has ever before undergone, have left its substantial accuracy unimpaired. There are unquestionably variations here and there from original copies and from the later photo-lithographic reproductions; none, however, of any importance have been, so far as is known, fixed upon the reprint. And these variations, insignificant as they are, do not necessarily impute want of exactness to the proof-readers of Booth's text, for individual copies of the First Folio differ among themselves more widely than the Booth reprint does from any one of them. Collation of many among the three or four hundred copies of the Folio known to exist indicates that, like most of the books of its time, it underwent correction while passing through the press, and suggests its existence, according to Dr. Ingleby, in at least three states, which he designates as being respectively, of the First, Second and Third Periods.*

---

*Preface to Part III., p. 4 (in large paper copies).

†" . . . let me say, that all copies of the first Fo. fall into three classes.

"The arliest have a peculiar pagination of the *Histories,* and two misprints in *III. Henry VI.*

P. 153 is misprinted 163.

P. 164 is misprinted 154.

Also (but not peculiar to these)

165 [is misprinted] 167.

166 [is misprinted] 168.

And on P. 172, col. 2 (i. e. *III. Hen.* VI., V. 7, 25 and 27) and is misprinted add, and kis is misprinted 'sis.

"The next later issue has two misprints also; and

P. 165 is misprinted 167.

and 166 is misprinted 168—

Mr. Booth's proof-readers had (as Mr. Booth wrote me) seven copies more or less perfect, to refer to in case of doubt as to a letter,* and this great reprint is therefore an eclectic and not a fac-simile. Without this explanation, I should have said, by Dr. Ingleby's test, that the Booth Reprint was taken from a Third Period copy, such as is the Grenville copy in the British Museum. The Bankside has followed what is known as the Phoenix First Folio, in the library of Columbia College in the city of New York.*

Speaking of the variations of the genuine copies of the First Folio, the Cambridge Editors go so far as to say: "It is probable that no one copy exactly corresponds with any other copy," although the discrepancy may often be "in a single letter only." It is, therefore, a fact, that in speaking of the Folio of 1623, we have no one acknowledged standard to which the variae lectiones of different copies may be referred, and this is equally true of the reprints as of the originals.

The laborious collation which I had occasion to make of the King Lear (for Volume X. of The Bankside), with Staunton's photo-lithographic reproduction, has strongly exemplified the inconvenience of lacking a standard of reference. A score of differences, thus noted, are reduced by comparison with a copy of the original (Mr. Furness's) to only four, one literal, and three of punctuation. On Page 292, column 1, line 6 (F. 1102 Bankside), Booth's reprint reads "King, and" instead of "King, and" as in the original. On page 293, column 2, line 18 from the bottom (F. 1335, Bankside), "eyes, but" should be "eyes. but". On page 301, column 1, penultimate line (F. 2277, Bankside), "Yours, in" should be "Yours in." And

---

but it has not the two errors of pagination already specified as peculiar to the earliest issue.

"The latest issue has 'and' 'kis,' and I have found a perfect uniformity of paging and mispaging in all the copies that have those two words correctly. . . . Lord Ellesmere's copy belongs to the Second Period; the Grenville and other B. M. copies belong to the Third Period. These may serve as typical copies." (Letter of C. M. Ingleby to S. A. Allibone, Nov. 8, 1879, quoted in Lenox Library Catalogue of Works of Shakespeare, 1880, p. 33).

*"I had seven copies more or less perfect of the First Folio Shakespeare to refer to in case of doubt as to a letter—one belonging to the late Col. Wigran, and I think passed into Mr. Halliwell's hands; another to a Mrs. Hartree; and the others, which my late uncle got from the late Edmund Malone, have been dispersed I know not where," says Mr. Booth.

* So called because bequeathed to the library of that institution by W. S. Phoenix, Esq., of New York City. This copy is one of the tallest extant, being 12⅝ inches by 8¼ wide. Almost without a blemish, the paper firm and the impression clear and perfect.

on page 309, column 2, about half way down (F. 3260, Bankside) the stage-direction "He dies." should read either "He dis." (Staunton's) "H e dis." Capell's copy (cit Cambridge Editors), and the Phoenix, or "H edis." (Furness's copy). There is nothing to prevent the reprint from agreeing with the original followed by Booth's proof-readers, and in the absence of knowledge of the precise copy used by them, no positive charge of error can be brought against their work. A good illustration of this point is found on page 299 of the Folio, column 2, Scena Septima, line 2 (F. 2047, Bankside), where Booth's text gives "hin," while Staunton's, and several copies of the original, kindly collated for me by Mr. Albert R. Frey, and the Chatto and Windus reduced fac-simile read "him." But Mr. Furness, to whose considerate aid I am much indebted, informs me that his copy reads "hin," like Booth's.

The first reprint of the First Folio rationally deserving the name of Fac-simile, appeared in 1866, under the supervision of Mr. Howard Staunton. It is a photo-lithograph, admirably executed as such work ran twenty years ago, by R. W. Preston, and was announced to be made from the Ellesmere copy in Bridgewater House and from "copies" in the National Library (British Museum). As there are three copies of the 1623 Folio in the British Museum—the Grenville copy (of the Third Period), that in the Royal Library of George III, and one formerly belonging to the Rev. Mordaunt Cracherode (the Period of which I have not yet ascertained)—there may possibly be uncertainty that the Staunton fac-simile is not patchworked from four copies of the original, although Winsor says that it was photo-lithographed from two only—the Ellesmere and Grenville copies—"taking a page from one or the other, where its condition best answered his purpose." It is, at any rate, quite uncertain from which copy any particular page is reproduced. This is unfortunate, in view of the different Periods combined, and the many discrepancies between known copies. For this reason alone, Staunton's can never be a universally acceptable standard.

Moreover, despite its convenience because representing to the eye the size and "typographical phenomena" of the genuine Folio page, the Staunton fac-simile was not perfect. Photo-lithography has never been a perfected art. What between the eccentricities of the wet-collodion film and the irregularities of the process of transference from the negative to the stone through the medium of a print in unctuous ink, there is an unhappy blurring and spreading of the lines in some places and a lack of impression in others. Retouching is unavoidable, even at the present time—after twenty years of

progress;—and when photo-lithography was still a "newly discovered process" it was necessarily often resorted to. But the moment hand and eye get a chance to intervene in reproductive work, humanum est errare. In the cross-bars of the letter e and the f and long s, and in respect to battered type and punctuation, the Staunton Folio is, in spots, admittedly defective.

The next reprint was the reduced photo-lithographic reprint, miscalled "fac-simile," in small octavo, published by Chatto & Windus in 1876, with an Introduction by the veteran, Dr. Halliwell Phillipps, which, as I take it, is the extent of his connection with the enterprise. Its cheapness, 8s, 6 d., is its chief discommendation, for it has been an inducement to put a defective text in the hands of many who are thereby led to suppose themselves, says Dr. Halliwell-Phillipps, "on a level with the envied possessors of the far-famed original." (The plates were sold to Funk & Wagnalls, of New York City, in 1885, and that firm brought out an impression even worse and more trying to the eyes than the English one, which sold at $2.50.) The typography is small enough, and the blurring and general sloppiness of the workmanship bad enough, to make its use perilous without a magnifying-glass and a safety-valve. Neither the title-page nor the Preface give any indication of the original copy from which it has been "reduced." The late Dr. Ingleby, who, with all his virtues and exceeding geniality, indulged at times in needless causticity, spoke of it as "a reduced reproduction of Mr. Staunton's Folio;" and added, "But why is Mr. Staunton not mentioned?" But there were peculiarities in the Chatto & Windus photo-text which did not seem referable to the Staunton.

In 1883, William Patterson, a publisher of Edinburgh, issued a handsomely printed edition of Shakespeare's works, in eight 8vo. volumes, reproducing the text of the First Folio, but it is in no sense a fac-simile. The reduced type reprint of Booth is so easily attainable at moderate cost that few students, even of the "common" class, will care to be without it. Of the four complete reprints thus far vouchsafed to us, it is probably as safe to refer to the Booth text for the decision of a disputed reading as to any known original of the 1623 Folio, short of the Grenville copy in the British Museum; which as one of the most perfect of the Third Period copies, and as the standard of the National Library, may be regarded as invested with a pre-eminence of its own to which all conflicting texts must yield. Mr. Furness—than whom no more impartial and capable judge in such matters exists—writes me the following: "It is my settled conviction, founded on an experience of twenty years, that Booth's Reprint is the very best reprint of so large a work that the world has ever seen, or is likely to see. Consider-

ing the variations in the copies of F 1, I doubt if a single misprint can be fastened upon Booth. Because his reprint differs, no matter how widely, from my original, I shouldn't think of imputing an error to him." It is proper to add that the large-paper copies of Booth's reprint, which were first issued in three parts, are the more truthworthy, for I have found in the small-paper copies later issued, in which the serial character of the three parts is abandoned, indications of a deterioration of the presswork inseparable from the printing of a large edition. But, twenty-five years after, The Clarendon Press, Printers to the University of Oxford, issued a First Folio in fac-simile, and the Messrs. Methuen of London, have since published in fac-simile—"collotype" fac-similes of the four Folios.

But, although we now have plenty of fac-similes of the four great Folios, they do not meet the requirements of any serious effort to compare parallel texts, such as of the Folio with the reprints of the earlier Quartos. Ready-prepared parallel texts have not hitherto been generally accessible. With the exception of the side-by-side reprints of the Folio and First Quarto of Henry V., edited by Dr. Nicholson and published in 1877 by the New Shakespere Society, and the lately printed parallel Folio and "Pide Bull" texts of the King Lear and of the Hamlet, prepared by Professor Victor, of Marburg, and published by Whittaker in London, 1886, I know of none which bring the Folio and the early Quartos into juxtaposition in the manner pursued in our own Society's Bankside Edition. Dr. Morgan's "Hamlet and the Ur-Hamlet," in the Bankside Restoration Shakespeare, parallels the text of the 1604, (the second Quarto) Hamlet with a conjectural "Kyd" text of that Play, (on the inference that the German "Brudermord" was somehow lifted from the performances of English actors who found their way into Germany, and who had the "Kyd" Hamlet in their repertory). This, taken as supplementary to Mr. Vining's Hamlet in Mr. Bankside Shakespeare, which parallel the 1603 (first Quarto) Hamlet with the First Folio text of that play, gives the student a complete equipment for satisfying himself at all points as to the text of that play, and an arsenal of arguments for controversy, should he be controversally inclined, touching what is, perhaps, the most mooted of all moot-questions in Shakespearean fields—the Genesis of Hamlet. We have also many parallel texts of different Quartos (without the Folio), such as Mr. Samuel Timmins' exquisite reproduction of the Devonshire Hamlets (the Quartos of 1603 and 1604), printed by Mr. Josiah Allen at Birmingham, and the New Shakespere Society's Romeo and Juliet, in 1874. The German critics appear to be especially fond of the parallel study of the Quartos.

But the New York Shakespeare Society's Bankside Shakespeare furnished a critically edited uniform and exact parallel version of all the plays found in quarto and folio form. And in it the student who seeks to compare a disputed passage or to collate for himself an entire play, has but to open his volume and find the two texts before him, each line duplicated or corresponding line placed exactly opposite, or, when the correspondence is in the point of the action at which the play has arrived rather than the words, he has the extra outside column on the quarto page which at once directs his eye to the parallelization without the slightest effort on his part to count forward or backward to an arbitrary starting-point in either text. It is just here that the loss of time has crept in, of which I so bitterly complain in all editions except the Bankside. The problem was to find the parallel passages. Not one of the complete Folio reprint texts has a standard line-notation, to facilitate cross-reference. The few Quarto texts that are line-numbered follow no co-ordinated system. Each editor adopts his own no-system, and, in the mass, confusion necessarily results. It is worse than the simple absence of a Canon—it is an ever-present conflict and discord.

For a century and a half, from Rowe to the Cambridge Editors, Shakespeare's plays remained without a convenient scheme of reference numeration. The primitive citation of act and scene was alone available. The labor of finding a hurriedly sought-for line or word in a scene of six or seven hundred lines in length, such at 1 Henry IV., II., iv. (602 lines), or Hamlet, II., ii. (634) was appalling, and in the dear old days of Mrs. Clarke's Concordance, before we had "The Globe," and before Bartlett's great Concordance followed "The Globe," was often prohibitive. There were, to be sure, some few editions of separate plays with numbered lines, but they were either school-editions, usually curtailed by expurgation, or Continental reproductions, and no two texts of the same play by different editors would agree. It was not until Clark and Wright, after numbering the lines of the Cambridge edition for convenience in collating the foot-notes, conceived the happy thought of numbering the lines of the Globe edition. Number the pentameter lines of the passage in verse, and the type-lines of the prose passages, omitting numeration of the stage directions. Thus, in Macbeth, II., 16-17, the dialogue

Lady M. I heard the owl scream and the crickets cry.
Did you not speak?
Macb. When?

Lady M. Now.
Macb. As I descended?

makes six lines of type and is numbered as two. ("The line-numbers are those of the Globe edition, even where they are wrong, as they once or twice are." (Griggs' fac-simile Quarto 1, Love's Labor Lost, 1598, p. xv.) that a popular reference Shakespeare lay at hand. Of course, the Globe and Cambridge texts do not agree—the difference in the width of the type-form and the varying spacing break up the arrangement of all parts where prose is used (as is seen in Hamlet II., ii., which counts 581 lines in the Cambridge edition and 634 in the Globe). But the convenience of the natty little single volume of the Globe, with its creamy paper, its singularly clear-faced type, and its cheapness, joined to the natural craving of the human mind for some sort of a canon of uniformity, caused the Shakespearian world to seize upon the Globe as a standard of reference; and the scholar, the professor, and the casual critic have accepted, by a sort of lex non scripta, the citation of act, scene, and line of the Globe, even where it is wrong. And yet, in spite of the alacrity with which the Globe edition was admitted as the line-numbered standard, and the practical universality of its use, not a single modern edition follows throughout the numeration of the Globe. Take, for example, Hamlet's "dull and muddy-mettled rascal," which, according to the Globe, is II., ii., 594—we run it to earth in a few other editions professing to be numbered for "convenience of reference" and find that its number is: in the Cambridge edition and in Furness's Variorum (which follows the Cambridge), 541; Leopold, 575; Rolfe's, 552; Clark and Wright's Clarendon Press series, 548; Richard Grant White's Riverside edition, 535; and Tschischwitz's, 593. In the new Henry Irving edition, alone, does the line-number, 594, agree with that of the Globe. Is there not a touch of satire upon the critical faculty of the professional critic, to find that, in three editions by the same editor, W. G. Clark, the same line has three different line-numbers?

Having ascertained the line-number of a particular phrase, according to the Globe standard, this is merely a guide to its approximate position in some other edition, if the latter happen to be line-numbered too. But it is not even a guide to the neighborhood, if the editor mounts some pet hobby and adopts a notation of his own, like Karl Elze, who numbers his Hamlet (London 1882) by 241 paragraphs of from 12 to 20 lines continuously throughout the play, which makes our dull and muddy-mettled rascal "peak" in paragraph No. 100. Elze says of this system, "The division into paragraphs . . . is transferable to all editions without any the least diffi-

culty, so that in time a uniform mode of reference may be adopted by the students of Shakespeare in all parts of 'the habitable globe.' It is true that numbering by paragraphs does not enable the student or reader to refer to a particular line, yet the average length of the paragraphs (numbering between twelve and twenty lines) is so convenient that the eye will catch in an instant the passage or word referred to." Leo's earlier Coriolanus (London 1864) which gives a photo-lithograph of the First Folio text, is divided into 255 sections coincident with the natural pauses or transitions of the dialogue. Craik has broken up Julius Caesar much more generously, having allotted 795 paragraphs to it, on the general plan of numbering each speech, whether of a single word or of many lines. (The English of Shakespeare. London, 1878).

All paragraphical divisions of the Plays seem to proceed on the assumption that it is practicable to divide a mingling of rapid dialogue and soliloquy into verses, as the Bible was first paragraphed by Robert Stephens in 1551. If it were possible to devise a natural separation into short verses of tolerably uniform length, like the Bible-verses, the scheme would be applicable to all texts and in all languages. But Leo's and Elze's divisions are too long, and those of Craik too irregular, to suggest much hope of an acceptable paragraph-division.

Turning to the Folios and Quartos, we find no canon of notation, and indeed, none is possible which depends on the act, scene, and line division of modern editions.

Of the Quartos published prior to the date of the 1623 Folio, but one has a vestige of act and scene division, and in that one, the Othello of 1622, the only divisions are Act II., sc. i.; Act IV., and Act V.

In the First Folio, only six plays are divided into acts and scenes in the same way that the Globe arranges them. Examining the volume, we find of the 36 plays:

I. Six not divided at all:

2 Henry VI. 3 Henry VI. Troilus and Cressida. Romeo and Juliet. Timon of Athens. Antony and Cleopatra.

These all begin bravely with "Actus Primus. Scena Prima," and there an end.

II. Eleven divided into acts only:

Comedy of Errors. Much Ado About Nothing. Love's Labor Lost. Midsummer Night's Dream. Merchant of Venice. All's Well that Ends Well. Henry V. Coriolanus. Titus Andronicus. Julius Caesar. Taming of the Shrew.

III. One partly divided into acts and scenes:

Hamlet.

which has Act I. divided into 3 scenes, and Act II. into 2 scenes, but the last of these (which begins correspondingly to Act II., sc. ii., of the Globe) runs through the rest of the play.

IV. Twelve are divided into acts and scenes, but these do not agree throughout with the Globe division:

Measure for Measure. King John. Richard II. 1 Henry IV. 2 Henry IV. 1 Henry VI. Richard III. Henry VIII. Macbeth. King Lear. Othello. Cymbeline.

V. Six are divided into acts and scenes which agree throughout with the Globe division:

Tempest. Two Gentlemen of Verona. Merry Wives of Windsor. As You Like It. Twelfth Night. Winter's Tale.

Thus, only one play in six of the First Folio, and not one of the early Quartos, can be depended upon for the location of a reference to act and scene—which is all that the student has to work upon when he goes to the old texts from Bartlett's Concordance, or from the best modern edition of the Plays. Even when Schmidt's Lexikon refers him to the line-number, it is but a vague indication of the locality, unless the scene be a short one. There is nothing to be done but to guess about where the passage is that is sought, and then hunt till it is found—if it be there!

It is not always there. Many of the modern texts are made up with the addition of passages from the Quartos which are not found in the Folio, and in few editions is the insertion noted. Singer, Richard Grant White, Charles Knight, and some others follow the convenient method, as old as the time of Johnson and Malone, of bracketing the words or phrases imported into the Folio text, but the editions commonly furnished to the student for purposes of study, such as Rolfe's and the other school texts, and the popular reading editions—such as the Globe, the Handy Volume, the Leopold, and the rest—give no sign in the body of the text that whole passages like the important "dram of eale" speech in Hamlet, or the exquisite scene in Lear, IV., iii., where "a Gentleman" describes to Kent Cordelia's "demonstration of grief" on hearing of her father's expulsion by the Pelican daughters, Regan and Goneril, "i' th' storm, i' th' night," are not found in the Folio.

But the labor of lighting upon a passage with which the eye of the searcher is familiarized by a fresh perusal of the context—so that in turning over the Folio or Quarto pages mnemonic guide-posts and mile-stones start

up, as it were, to point and measure the path—is slight compared to that involved in the most common and wearisome employment of the old texts: the hunting down of parallel locutions and similar uses of unusual words, which may serve to interpret the meaning of a doubtful passage. As emendation often brings into apparent relation phrases which have no visible connection in the older authorities, the confrontation of the Folios and Quartos is, for this work, indispensable.

I may be permitted to illustrate, by a practical "demonstration," the interminable circumlocution of such a search, even where the number of instances of supposed parallelism is limited.

Let us assume that I am not entirely satisfied with the accepted reading of Edmund's phrase in Lear. (Bankside, Q. 315-351, F.)

> "Well, my legitimate, if this letter speed,
> And my invention thrive, Edmund the base
> Shall top the legitimate. I grow; I prosper:
> Now, gods, stand up for bastards!"

All the critical editions at command tell me that "top the legitimate" is altered from "to th' legitimate" of the Old texts, and inform me that "top" means over-top. I have some passing doubts about this, and being unwilling to accept an emendation of the authoritative text of the concurring Folios and Quartos without first excluding every interpretation whereby a plausible meaning may be forced out of the old form, it occurs to me that alteration may after all be really needless—that the words "I grow; I prosper:" may perhaps stand for "aye grow, aye prosper," and that the uncommendably economical printers of the old texts set up I for aye, as they generally did for ay. But, before I can attach any plausibility to my incohate theory, it behooves me to ascertain whether there is in the old copies any instance of "aye" (meaning ever, forever, always) being phonetically and typographically equal to I long, instead of being sounded like a long, as we employ it, and as there is every reason to suppose the Elizabethan Englishman did.

Supposing then that I have not the Bankside Edition; to begin my unpromising task systematically, I first consult the Cambridge or Furness's Variorum, to make sure that I have not been anticipated. I find that while "top the legitimate" is Capell's generally accepted reading, Pope would have it "be th' legitimate," Hanmer wanted to "toe th' legitimate," Jennens wished to see Edmund out or rout his better-born brother, and Mason conjectured "foe the legitimate." Not much help there.

Schmidt, in his version of Act I. of Lear, would read (cit. Furness) "Ay, grow; ay, prosper:"—but ay here has the significance of yea verily, and is not satisfactory.

I next ascertain by the Globe that the line in question is Lear, I., ii., 21. I locate it in Booth's or Staunton's 1623 reprint, without trouble, for the Globe division of the first act of Lear is found to follow the Folio, and there it reads:

"Shall to' th' Legitimate: I grow, I profper:"

Then turning to Praetorius' Quarto fac-similes of the Pide Bull and N. Butter texts of 1608, I find the phrase printed as prose, thus:

" . . . Edmund the bafe shall tooth' legitimate: I grow, I prof-per, now Gods ftand vp for Baftards."

The Folio reference may be noted, for convenience, as "p. 286, col, 1, line 3," the Quarto references are, for the Pide Bull, "Q_1, sig. C, lines 12 and 11 from bottom," and for the N. Butter copy, "Q_2 sig. B_2, lines 4 and 3 from bottom."

On opening Mrs. Cowden-Clarke's Concordance, I find there given just sixteen cases of "aye," one of which is a compound and is known to be a conjectural reading for the "ayre-remaining" of the Folio. Five examples are of "aye" by itself, the other ten read "for aye." Turning to Dr. Schmidt's Lexikon, I find that he gives all the examples, which he by no means does in every case, for his book is not a concordance, but a dictionary. The sixteen instances occur in Troilus and Cressida and Timon of Athens (which are not divided), Midsummer Night's Dream (which is divided into acts only), Hamlet (which while purporting to be divided into acts and scenes is practically undivided), Macbeth, Richard II., Lear and Cymbeline (which are divided, but not as in the Globe), The Tempest (which is the only one of the sixteen agreeing with the Globe division), and Pericles, which is not in the Folio of 1623.

Next, to familiarize the eye with the context, each reference must be located, seriatim, in the Globe edition by the help of Schmidt's Lexikon. The first two in Troilus and Cressida are very near the end of the play, and so are found without difficulty in both Folio and Quarto. Macbeth, IV., i., 133, is found in a moment, by the context. Lear, V., ii., 235, is near the end, and for that reason soon lighted upon (in the Pide Bull it is spelt "ay"). Cymbeline, IV., iv., 27, is hit upon without trouble, for the scene number here agrees. Tempest, II., i., 285, occurs in a long scene and is most easily looked for by noting that it falls in Antonio's longest speech therein. Tempest, IV., 218, is found by running the eye up and down two or three columns. Hamlet,

III., ii., 210, requires a little search, but we observe that it lies about the middle of the player-king's longest speech, and in turn look for this in the old texts until it is found, there being no divisions to guide the eye after the 2d Act. Midsummer Night's Dream, I., i., 71 and 90, are both in speeches of Theseus, and are located by the context (in the second instance it is spelt "aie" in the Folio, but not so in the Roberts and Fisher Quartos). Midsummer Night's Dream, III., ii., 387, falls in a terribly long scene of 464 lines, and the Folio is divided into acts only, so that it must be hunted for by the aid of a tolerable acquaintance with the context and after a little thumbing, it being remembered that the line sought is the last in one of Puck's speeches. (In the marginal act-scene-and-line notation of the Griggs Quarto, the line-number is given as "400," and not the 387 of the Globe.) Richard II., V., ii., 40, is identified by lying at the end of York's long speech. Troilus and Cressida, III., ii., 167, involves quite a long hunt, being about the middle of an undivided play, and is picked out after going through all of Troilus's olnger speeches in that neighborhood. It is more readily located in the 1609 Quarto reprint, for Mr. Griggs has line-numbered his text in conformity with the Globe notation; it is there misprinted "age." Timon, V., i., 55, and V., iv., 78, have to be run to earth, because the play is not divided. Pericles, V., iii., 94, is distinguished in the Quartos by being in Grower's epilogue.

All this is tedious to rehearse, and much more tedious to do. By actual count, sixty-five minutes were consumed in this collation of only sixteen texts; the barren result being to establish that the word is spelt once "aie," once "ay," once misprinted "age," and for the rest uniformly "aye." So the conjecture is reluctantly laid on the shelf for the present, in the faint hope that, sometime, examples may be stumbled upon of "aye" being pronounced in rhyme like "I;" or of the printed "I," where commonly taken to mean the pronoun or the affirmative, admitting also equivalence with "aye" —ever.

The Globe numbering, because of its convenience, took hold almost immediately upon the appearance of the volume. It filled an evident want, and it appears to have "come to stay." Had any of the four fac-simile reprints of the First Folio, or of the many reprints of the Quartos, been intelligently line-numbered at the start, they would have promptly become standards of reference, in the same way as the Globe.

A good many of the Quarto reprints are line-numbered—but how? By following the act-scene-and-line notation of the Globe. Most of the Griggs-Praetorius fac-similes do this. Some of them have special notation, as the

1603 Hamlet (with which the series began)—which, in addition to the Globe notation, is divided into consecutive scenes, eighteen in all, but without act-division, each scene being independently line-numbered. So, also, with the Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602, The Taming of a Shrew, 1594, and the two Henry V. Quartos, 1600 and 1608.

In some cases a composite notation is adopted. In Mr. P. A. Daniel's parallel texts of Romeo and Juliet (New Shakespere Society, 1874), the marginal division of the fuller Quarto 2 is into acts and scenes, and each scene is line-numbered, not however to correspond with the Globe standard but serially as the lines run in the Quarto imprint; while the shorter Quarto 1 of 1597 is arbitrarily numbered to match the other. Dr. Brinsley Nicholson's parallel volume of the first Quarto and the Folio of Henry V. (New Shakspere Society, 1877) has both texts numbered by act, scene, and old-text scene-line, so that the line-numbers of the two pages do not agree and the parallelism is only apparent to the eye. Examples of such variant numeration might be indefinitely prolonged.

If we pick up a modern critical edition of almost any classical or archaic text, we find that it has a system of reference-notation which enables a phrase to be readily indicated and at once singled out. Prose writings are mostly paragraph-or section-numbered, poems line-numbered. The continental classical epics or metrical romances, such as the Livre d'Alexandre, the Poema del Cid, the Poema de Alfonso Onceno, the Nibelungen, the Gedichte of Walther von der Vogelweide, are all line-numbered. So too are our Chaucer and Spenser. This convenient system comes to an abrupt halt at the threshold of the drama, where it is most needed—for of all awkward schemes of notation, the act-and-scene division is the clumsiest for instant reference.

I claim that a standard archaic text, which has become a daily resort for precise reference, as the 1623 Folio and the early Quartos of Shakespeare's plays have become, should be continuously line-numbered, following the typographical lines of the original copy from the first to the last, and including every word of the author's composition—stage-directions as well as text—so that a single reference-number will locate a line once for all, in any critical fac-simile reprint.

The simple fact is, that until the Bankside Edition, what little approach there was visible toward a uniform system of notation for critical reprints of the old Folio and Quarto texts, sprang from the attempt to refer the old text to the act-scene-and-line numbering of the Globe edition. This was unquestionably a convenience and a great one. But it was only a step, and, by

the arbitrary character of its notation (rendered still more arbitrary by its plan of ascertaining for itself the length of a "line" by scansion or other convenient process rather than taking the actual line of the First Folio), yet failed in very numerous and important cases to guide the students to points to which their attention was to be directed. To illustrate this, let us take the case of these early stage directions, which not only are so often relied upon to supply the action and even the narrative of the text, but embalm so much of stage history and illustration of the scenic contrivances and methods of the Shakespearian theatres.

It has been the custom, heretofore, in all schemes of reference numeration, to pass over the stage-directions and to number only the metrical or prose-printed lines of the dialogue. Yet the stage-directions are often, for the purposes of critical examination, of equal value with the spoken text. Archaic words or uses of words occur in the stage-business even more frequently than in the speeches. What the author briefly tells the actor to do, or tells the reader that the actor is doing, is often one of those firm, comprehensive touches that go to the making up of a masterpiece. From every point of view, critical, historical, histrionical, or philological, the stage-directions deserve to be included in a systematic notation. It is especially so in the case of the Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, where moot questions of priority of composition and of publication, the identity of transcription, whether the play has been set up from a legitimate manuscript or from short hand notes surreptitiously taken during public representation and read aloud to the compositor, and the like problems, may be as much elucidated by the unspoken stage-directions as by the dialogue.

For instance, in the comparison of the old Quarto text the First part of the Contention, 1594, with the revised Whole Contention, 1619, and with the Folio copy of 2 Henry VI., the stage business plays an important part, for it is found, time and again, to be identical in the three, thus bridging over the gap of twenty-nine years which is unspanned by the conspicuously amended texts of the successive issues.

Take this direction as a sample:

"Enter at one Doore the Armorer and his Neighbors, drinking to him, so much, that hee is drunke; and he enters with a Drumme before him, and his Staffe, with a Sand-bagge fastened to it; and at the other Doore his Man, with a Drumme and Sand-bagge and Prentices drinking to him."—2 Henry VI., Fo. 129, col. 1, top. Bankside, F. 1114-1118.

So the Folio. The 1619 and 1594 texts agree, with the single exception

that the peculiar participal form of the Folio, drunke, appears in the more primitive shape, drunken, in the earlier texts. The Folio also marks the then growing tendency to capitalize substantives in the newly fashionable Continental way, and to needlessly double the consonants, as in "Drumme" for the "drum" of the Quarto. Passing by the grammatical aspects, an interesting thing about this passage is its view of manners and customs. The deadly sand-bag is therein mentioned twice, and for the only times in all the Plays, so far as I know, for the word is nowhere found in the dialogue-text from which concordances and glossaries are made. The picture which is conjured up the drunken Armorer, and his antagonist, each with a drum—and armed with a sand-bag attached, in flail-fashion, to a cudgel—ready for the combat which is so soon to result fatally to the traitor, is graphic to the life. It is as integrally a part of the play as the dialogue descriptive of the fight, which follows it. But the concordances and the lexicons, and the line-numbers of all the editions, skip it. If I wished to make a precise reference to it, I would be puzzled to indicate its location concisely by any systematic notation. It seems barbarous to have to say that it is to be found "between lines 58 and 59 of 2 Hen. VI., II., iii., Globe ed.;" or as at the "top of col. 1 of p. 129 of the Histories in Fo. 1:" or as being "sig. D. verso, lines 18— 21, of The Whole Contention, Praetorius's fac-simile, pt. 1;" or as "p. 28, lines 27-31 Halliwell's reprint of The Contention, 1594, First Sketch of 2 Hen. VI., Old Sh. Soc'y, 1843." Now, however, by means of our Bankside Edition, when students wish to refer to the curious and instructive old stage-direction (which supplies so much of the action just there that to omit it would be to omit a part of the scene itself) the student will be able to fix it by stating that it occurs at "Q. 826-1114 F."—which will be understood to mean that it is line 826 of the 1594 Contention and line 1114 of the First Folio. And, moreover, by means of the Concordance in the present volume, one not fortunate enough to possess a set of the Bankside can also make this statement; for, by referring to the Concordance he will see that the stage-direction which occurs between lines 58 and 59 of the Globe edition (or of any edition which adopts the Globe line-numbers) must necessarily be Q. 826-1114 F.

The valuable stage directions of the old texts count by hundreds. They narrate a good part of the history found in the English series, and, by describing actions which are mentioned by the Chroniclers, but which are not referred to in the dialogue, they form an additional indication of the closeness with which the old historians were followed in the plays. What would Henry VIII. be without them? ("Many of the stage-directions in this play

are very remarkable, and are evidently written with great care. The modern editors have for the most part retained their substance, and in some cases their words. We shall more closely follow the original, with such slight changes as are absolutely necessary to make the scene intelligible."—Knight, Pict. Sh. Histories, Vol. II., p. 341.) The description of the royal procession and entrance which prefaces the Trial scene, Act II., sc. iv., is as serviceable a reproduction of the sightly spectacle as a painting by Veronese; but gorgeous as it is, it is eclipsed by the Order of the Coronation, Act IV., sc. i., which takes up 31 unnumbered lines of the Globe. The Procession is in substantial agreement with the accounts of Holinshed and Cavendish, and the Coronation is condensed with great exactness from Hall.

Moreover, the stage-directions furnish the students with instructive examples of archaic words and uses of words not found elsewhere in the plays, and as much hapax legomenon as any once-used word of the dialogue. Again, they illustrate the conditions of early stage representation, often primitive to a degree difficult to realize nowadays, as in Cymbeline, p. 376, col. 1, line 4 from bottom, Fo. 1—"Enter Imogen, in her Bed, and a Lady." Here, as in Heywood's A Woman Kild with Kindness (Pearson's reprint, v. 2, p. 154)—"Enter Mistris Frankeford in her bed," and as in Brome's A Mad Couple Well Match'd (Pearson's reprint, Act IV., sc. iii., p. 73)—"The Bed put forth, Alicia in it" (a stage-direction which is identical—except as to Alicia in it—with that at F. 1848 of the second part of Henry the Sixth)—there being no change of scene possible—a bed, with the personage upon it, asleep, was actually thrust forth upon the stage.* But of the vivid trait thus presented, there is not a suggestion in the editions prepared for the "common reader." Even Richard Grant White, who stood up as a doughty champion for the authority and comparative purity of the Folio text, and who could not admit so much as a single word from the Quartos without enclosing it in denunciatory brackets, hewed and hacked the stage-directions mercilessly, as every editor from Rowe's time has done. Rowe's direction here is elaborate enough, but White's is more so, and the reader is to behold, in his mind's eye—"Imogen's Bed-chamber; in one part of it a Trunk. Imogen reading in her bed; a Lady attending." It is so throughout the plays—the stage-directions, instead of being offered to our view "cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the reft, abfolute in their numbers, as he conceiued the," are "maimed, and deformed by the frauds and ftealthes of

*And see line F 1848 of the 2 *Henry* VI., Vol. XIX. *ante* and Dr. Morgan's comment thereon in page i of Introduction to Vol. XX.

iniurious impoftors, that expos'd them:" in the most injurious and stealthy of all forms of imposition upon the credulous reader—that of silent emendation at the mere whim of the editor.

The stage-directions of the old copies, and especially of the First Folio, which is in most cases the only canon to which we may appeal with any show of authority, should be held as sacred as the text itself, and not be departed from, nor added to, without critical cause and due announcement. For this reason, the stage business, even to the single word "Exit" when it stands as a line by itself, should be scrupulously numbered in a reference canon, as is done in the Bankside Edition. The same, too, of the line of type, whenever it occurs, denoting act and scene; for this is only found in half the plays in the Folio, and where it exists it is as much a part of the record as any other phrase.

If all reprints of the Folio and Quartos were numbered as in the Bankside, every line of type (except the head-lines and the catch-words, which belong to the printer and not to the stage copy) being consecutively noted, from "Actus Primus, Scena Prima" to "Finis," reference to every jot and tittle of the original text would be simplicity itself. How much easier to say "Othello, F_1, 1123," or "Hamlet Q_1, 1446," than to give a reference to act, scene, and line (which, as we have seen, helps little or not at all when delving into the old copies), or to devise such barbarous constructions as these —in the effort to be precise:

"Com. of Err. Fo. 1623, p. 88 (misprint for 86) col. 1, line 24."

"Tro. & Cres. Fo. 1 sig. ¶ ¶ 2 verso, col. 1 line 14 from bottom."

"Rich. III., Qo. 1597, sig. H, 8th page, line 3 from bottom."

"What, will the Line stretch out to' th' cracke of Doome?"

Besides the line-numbers, every reprint of an old text (except of course page-for-page fac-similes) might denote on one margin the beginning of each page and column of the Folios or signature-leaf of the Quarto. For the Folio, it would suffice to print the brief indication in full-faced (Clarendon) type behind a single bracket; thus, [218a. by common consent signifies the first column of page 218. To fix the signature-leaf of the Quartos would require asomewhat more conventional treatment, for the last leaf of each signature is generally unsigned. I observe among authorities a want of uniformity as to this class of references. In the New Shakespere Society's reprints, Dr. Brinsley Nicholson denotes the eight pages of a signature thus: B—B v—B 2—B 2 v—B 3—B 3 v—B 4—B 4 v—(or at least, in his paralleled texts of Henry V., he should do so, but by error the last leaf repeats "B 3" and "B 3 v," which is confusing), and he marks the end of the old

page, not the beginning as is most natural and usual. Still another method is to mark the signature pagination, at the beginning of each page, through the four leaves, thus: sig. B—sig. B, back—sig. B 2—sig. B 2, back—sig. B 3—sig. B 3, back—leaf B 4—leaf B 4, back. To this, however, the simpler notation of Dr. Nicholson, when set in the right place at the head of the page and not at the tail, would be preferable. In The Bankside Shakespeare, which proposes to be in itself an independent guide, this collation, after much consultation and experiment was reduced to the two tables printed at the end of each volume. These tables with the analysis of the pagination and signature-marking of the First Folio in the introduction to volume XX. will be found to adequately cover the entire subject while the reference might become as universal abbreviations as the Latin is a universal language to German-russian or Turk-christian or heathen and be perfectly and exactly intelligible, no matter what edition they had before then.

It seems to me that the critical reader, however humble the sphere of his criticism, has a right to a simple but uniform and immutable reference-standard. He needs, in the first place, a Canon, and in the second, the means of readily consulting it by means of a uniform system of line-notation covering the whole of the authoritative text. He needs, it is undeniable, a great deal else—and Time may eventually produce from the well-stored wallet at his back reprints of all the four old Folios, line-numbered as herein suggested, and produced with all the perfection of the new photo-incographic processes to which we owe the delicate reproductions of pen-drawings which have supplanted engravings in the pages of Puck and Life. There is, or should be, no excuse nowadays for blurred and misty reprints of old texts. The marvellous accuracy of reproduction which can give us the 799 pages of Skeat's Etymological Dictionary in a perfectly clear reduced form, and spread before us with microscopic perfection the eight column blanket-sheet of a daily newspaper in the compass of 4½x6 inches, is certainly capable of doing better work than the blotchy and slovenly, though valuable impressions that are known as the Griggs-Praetorius Quarto facsimiles, in one of which the general editor himself confesses (Corrections to Praetorius' Henry V., 2, i., 1600.) that some two hundred and odd letters needed touching up before the play was sufficiently legible for general perusal.

Why, then, is not the time rife for the inauguration of a lasting reform if the leading Shakespeare Societies of England, Germany, and America should, through a conference of delegates or otherwise, agree upon a canon and a systematic notation, so that henceforth the texts published under the

sanction of each Society should conform to the adopted standard, which, as to the first Folio, might conform as do our Bankside texts to the Grenville copy in the British Museum for Europe, and the Phoenix in the Library of Columbia College for America?

The New York Shakespeare Society moved to this end, by incorporating in The Bankside Edition of all the plays found in Quarto with the First Folia a notation which is certainly the first effort at a perfect numbering of lines—not arbitrarily adapted to the width of arbitrary pages, but in their original lengths, counting everything as a line which goes to the text or to the elucidation of its action—as the edition itself is the first and complete series of parallel texts ever attempted. This notation the Society hereby tenders to the use of Shakespeare students everywhere. By means of this there is now no reason why further error or tergiversation or periphrases should interfere to cloud or render a reference uncertain, whether the numeral be cabled under the Atlantic or signalled by a flash light over space.

ALVEY A. ADEE.

PETER CUNNINGHAM'S VINDICATION.

"The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones."

So it has been thus far with Peter Cunningham, the former Treasurer of The Shakespeare Society and for a long time the Chief Clerk of the Audit Office of London.

In 1868 Mr. Cunningham presented for sale to the British Museum two small manuscripts containing entries of the performance of plays during the years 1604-5 and 1611-12, some of which have Shakespeare's name. The offer was rejected, the documents were retained, and in due time Mr. Cunningham was publicly charged with their forgery. The accusations seem to have rested on vague hearsay statements and critical intuition. No defense was entered and no general explanation made. There the matter rested until the present year, when upon subsequent examination these manuscripts were pronounced genuine. Mr. Cunningham has not however been fully vindicated, for his right of possession is now denied, and he has been simply transferred from the gibbet of forgery to the gibbet of larceny. Since the charge of forgery has been removed a new interest has sprung up, and all the facts should be known. These documents can now be given their full weight; the defense of Mr. Cunningham's conduct should now be consid-

ered; and the former good name should be restored to a man who more than sixty years ago rescued these interesting and important papers from impending oblivion.

In Mr. Cunningham's vindication there is involved the question of fixing the dates of the composition or reproduction of some of Shakespeare's greatest plays; the terminus ad quem in each case; and these documents which are now shown to be genuine, record the performance of Othello in 1604, and The Winter's Tale and The Tempest in 1611. The former criticisms of Mr. Cunningham's conduct must now be recast, apologies will be in order, his good name will be gratefully restored. After forty years of imputation "he sleeps well", for the manuscripts he recovered and published have now been declared to be ancient and respectable, and the Introduction to his volume published in 1842 furnishes ample explanation of his right of possession. Vindication in this case is of especial satisfaction; it not only removes the cloud from Mr. Cunningham's reputation and relieves the Audit Office from the charge of negligence as to rare public documents, and The Shakespeare Society from carelessness in extending its auspices, but it removes some uncertainty surrounding the dates of these Shakespearian plays. The whole story has now taken on a new meaning and an increased importance.

A little more than forty years ago three articles appeared in different magazines, in which it was charged that Mr. Cunningham had fallen into a habit of intoxication, that in his baseness he had fabricated these Shakesperian documents, and in his perfidy he had attempted to sell them to the Manuscript Department of the British Museum. These articles appeared in the Athenaeum of June 20, 1868, in the Galaxy of November, 1868, and in the British Quarterly Review of January, 1869. The article in the Galaxy was signed by Richard Grant White; the other articles were anonymous. In 1874 Mr. White repeated the charges against Mr. Cunningham in his Introduction to the fac-simile reprint of Ireland's Confessions. From that time on nothing further seems to have been said against Mr. Cunningham, and until the present year nothing has been said in his favor. In the New Variorum Shakespeare Dr. Furness quoted at some length from these articles in discussing the dates of Othello and The Tempest. But for Peter Cunningham a brighter day was coming. Mr. Ernest Law, a London barrister, has recently published a volume entitled, Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries, a fac-simile of the most important of these two papers is given, the whole question is again open for discussion, and this time it will never be settled until it is settled right. This volume of Mr. Law seems to

be the final word upon the forgery of these documents. It now appears that Mr. Cunningham was unjustly accused of their fabrication; and it seems to be conclusively proved that the manuscripts are genuine. The authenticity of these entries will weigh heavily upon the dates involved, and the photographic fac-simile of "The Revells Booke Ano 1605" will be examined with great interest. Mr. Law's view of Mr. Cunningham's right of possession may be questioned, for the publication and retention of stolen papers would involve the Audit Office for not recovering them, and The Shakespeare Society in lending the influence of its name. The facts should now be told. As Falstaff says: "Is not the truth the truth?" Mr. Law's volume settles the question of forgery, and the genuineness of the Shakesperean entries. But as to the finding of the manuscripts, the right to their possession, the charge of larceny, the consequent carelessness of the Shakespeare Society, and the consequent negligence of the Audit Office in not demanding their return in 1842, he is peculiarly unhappy. Surely for all this a defense can be entered and an explanation made!

Mr. Law thinks that the story of the Books of Revels at Court is both strange and unusual. In his Preface he states his view at length: "Further than this; that that curious and very precious document, after having lain in obscurity for two centuries, should be discovered, only immediately to be buried and disappear again for forty years; that they should then be once more disinterred and re-discovered, to disappear again, for a third time, for another thirty years; that they should afterwards re-appear yet once more—under circumstances suggesting larceny, forgery and fraud—forthwith to be universally pronounced to be other than what they really are; and that only now they should, after more than a century of mystery and uncertainty, at last be unmistakably revealed in their true nature, must surely be unprecedented in the whole annals of our literature."

This statement is interesting, but in some respects it may be overdrawn. These documents have not been playing hide-and-seek in the manner and to the extent indicated. The mystery connected with them came with the charge of forgery, and with it has gone out; the confusion lasted only during the life of the accusation, and then it ceased. It nevertheless is true, as is further observed, that "a story of such strange vicissitudes befalling Shakesperian documents would seem to warrant a complete exposition of how it all came about." The mystery in the matter vanishes when the facts are understood when a correct view is taken of Mr. Cunningham's conduct in retaining the papers, and the reasons are given why the Audit Office did not recover their possession, and why they were "Printed for the Shake-

speare Society." It now seems marvelous that he should have been so hastily condemned in 1868 for what the writers and experts did not take the trouble to understand. Mr. Cunningham died on May 18, 1869, a few months after these accusations had been made against him, and it is a relief to think that in all probability he never knew of their circulation, and never dreamed that in after years his name would be coupled with a line of conduct which in his lifetime he would have looked on with scorn and contempt. In making his investigations as to the genuineness of these documents Mr. Law has done a real service. He may not have made a Shakesperian "find", but in publishing his volume he has established a Shakesperian "fact." It is now easy to understand what Malone meant when he said he knew that Othello was not one of the poet's latest compositions, and he further knew that The Tempest "had a being and a name in the autumn of 1611." The three-hundredth anniversary of the production of that wonderful play is a good time to have the date settled, and let it forever and ever be known that the year which furnished the Authorized Version of the Bible furnished The Tempest also. Any documents which will help establish the dates of Measure for Measure, Othello, The Winter's Tale and The Tempest are worthy of attention, and the Account Books of the Revel's Office will now be consulted as authorities, while as forgeries they only wrought confusion. Dr. Furness may now congratulate himself upon the extreme caution manifest in his notes published by him in his Othello in 1886, and in his Tempest in 1892. He will find but little to take back. In the latter volume he said: "The puzzle of the Revels Accounts may some day be solved. At present it is inscrutable." The solution is here; it overturns nothing but the accusations against Mr. Cunningham; and when there is no longer forgery in the documents, there is no more trouble in the case.

Peter Cunningham was born on April 7, 1816; the son of Allan Cunningham, a brother of Colonel Joseph and Admiral Cunningham. In 1834 at the instance of Sir Robert Peel he was appointed a clerk in the Audit Office, and after twenty years faithful service became its Chief Clerk. He was one of the founders of The Shakespeare Society, and became its permanent Treasurer. It may be that in later life he found himself in reduced circumstances because of excessive drinking, but this could bear on the question at issue only as showing a needy condition. His early life was active in literary and antiquarian matters, and beyond reproach; some of the volumes he published are of great merit and high authority; he retired from the Audit Office in 1860, and except for the attacks of his critics because of his connection with the Account Books of the Revels Office, his reputation is un-

sullied. In 1842 he published a volume bearing the authority of The Shakespeare Society, entitled "Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court." To this volume he wrote an extensive Introduction which at this time will bear him yeoman's service. At page 203 he printed Book XII of "The Revells Book Ano 1605," being "The Accompte of the Office of the Ruelles of this whole yeres Charge in Ano 1604: untell the last of October 1605." Sixteen entries of plays then being acted are found to have been made, eight of which refer to plays of Shakespeare; Love's Labor Lost, Comedy of Errors, Merry Wives of Windsor, Merchant of Venice, Henry Fifth, Measure for Measure, and Othello, the Merchant of Venice being entered twice. In the margin against four of these entries under the heading "The poets wch mayd the plaies," is found written the name "Shaxberd," while against two other entries are the names of "George Chapman" and "Hewood". The name of Ben Jonson does not appear against the two plays of his found in the entry.

On page 210 he printed "Book XIII. The Booke of the Revells Ending the last day of October Ano Dom: 1612," and in the entry states that The Tempest was played on "Hallomas nyght att Whithall" and ye winters nighte Tayle on the 5th of November. In Book XIII the name "Shaxberd" is not repeated. These entries have been accurately reprinted by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, and by Dr. Furness. If these entries are genuine it is clear that Measure for Measure and Othello were written by 1604, and The Winter's Tale and The Tempest by 1611.

During the twenty-six years between 1842 and 1868 the genuineness of these manuscripts was not questioned, but when Mr. Cunningham presented them to the British Museum for sale on the 29th day of April, 1868, the conflict was on. A different state of public feeling was encountered. The storm aroused by John Payne Collier and his "Perkins Folio" of 1632 had reached its height and was subsiding, but the waves were still rolling, and the sea was angry. New experts were springing up, and they could find it whether it existed or not. William Henry Ireland was remembered, but John Payne Collier, or some one else who had committed the forgeries, was in active existence. The public did not want any more Shakespearean forgeries, and they were not going to receive them. The critics were ready, they could decide and let inspection follow. When Mr. Cunningham, therefore, wrote to Sir Frederick Madden, the Keeper of the Manuscripts of the British Museum, enclosing these original documents, being Books XII and XIII of the entries he had published in 1842, in the second year's issue of The Shakespeare Society, and as his own property offered them for sale,

finally naming a price of sixty guineas, Pandora's box was again open, and the evils were out: "horsed upon the sightless couriers of the air," to "blow the horrid deed in every eye." Mr. Cunningham had told in his letter how he had come by the manuscripts, how he had found them "under the vaults of Somerset House—far under the Quadrangle in the dry and lofty cellar known by the name of the "Charcoal Repository," and then added: "Had I been a rich man I would have presented these highly interesting Papers to the Nation." The offer of sale was refused, and the documents were retained as public property by the officers of the Museum, and in due course were turned over to the Audit Office where they are now to be found. (Mr. Cunningham died the next year.) The resentment aroused by Payne Collier was abroad in the land; experts were now active and could find what was wanted; these documents, which for twenty-six years had borne good reputations, were now suddenly brought under suspicion because they had been offered for sale by a private citizen, although he had been Chief Clerk of the Audit Office and the Treasurer of The Shakespeare Society, and, with the highest endorsements, had published them in 1842. But the experts examined: "A glance was sufficient," "a palpable forgery" had been committed, and the lictors were ready. In a few weeks the matter got into print. The first article appeared in the Athenaeum on June 20, 1868; it recited what pretended to be the facts, and concluded as follows:

"It may be well that we should say under what circumstances these passages have at length fallen under suspicion. For many years the original papers have been wanting. Search, we believe, has often been made for them in our public offices without success. A few days ago some of them were offered for sale to the Manuscript Department of the British Museum. Mr. Bond carried them for verification to the Record Office, where they were at once impounded by Lord Romilly's directions as public property. How they came to be in private hands is a subject for inquiry—an inquiry which is now in hand. The gentleman who offered them for sale appears to have thought his right of property in them perfect. Papers thus recovered by the nation were very properly subjected to a very close inspection; and this inspection, it would seem, has satisfied the experts that gross liberties had been taken by some persons unknown with these documents. In fact, the experts arrived at the conclusion that the body of Shakespearean illustrations has been added to the originals. This is the worst bit of Shakespeare news we have had to report for many a day."

The experts were not certain, "and their witness agreed not together." It was not clear whether all of Book XII or any of Book XIII was forged.

and about the latter Book no definite opinion was held or expressed. Of course it was ridiculous for the writer of the article above quoted to say that he believed search had been made for the papers in the public offices without success. If he had but turned to the Introduction to the volume published in 1842 he would have then found the whole history told by Mr. Cunningham himself, and with that before them the inquiry then "in hand" might properly have come to an end. The writer had learned however, that "the gentleman who offered them for sale appears to have thought his right of property in them perfect." But the article in the Athenaeum in June was mild to what appeared in the Galaxy in November over the initials of Richard Grant White. Here the charge is made directly that a forgery had been committed, "a forgery, a gross forgery, from beginning to end." He did not claim to have examined the documents himself, or even to have seen them; but it was not only clear that a forgery was there, but the forger was identified; "The conclusion that Peter Cunningham is the man seems unavoidable." Mr. White must have arrived at his conclusion by intuition, in the same manner that Falstaff recognized the true prince—by instinct! When he repeated his accusations in 1874 it appears that his opinion had not changed, nor had his manner grown more considerate. The unknown writer in the British Quarterly Review for January, 1869, is no less certain and no less emphatic. He was not troubled with scruples, nor with an attempt to examine either the originals or the published volume of 1842. He says: "It only required a glance of the experts to discover that the list of Shakespeare's plays performed before the Court in the years alluded to, had been appended to the old documents by a modern hand. The trifling and uninteresting items of expenditure are genuine, but the book containing these appears to have also contained some blank pages, into which the forger has crammed the whole of the writings referring to Shakespeare." When these charges of forgery began to be circulated the real mystery began to appear, and the real difficulties multiplied. Facts would no longer harmonize with each other, and some jostling was noticed. It was soon shown by Halliwell-Phillipps in documents printed by him that Malone prior to his death in 1812, had among his papers a copy or a close abstract of the selfsame entries, and it was their presence which enabled him to say that he knew that Othello was in existence in 1604, and The Tempest in 1611. Now the wonder arose how Malone before 1812, had in his possession copies of documents which were not produced until about 1840. Or, to state, this mystery in another manner; How could Peter Cunningham about 1840 forge documents which were in existence before he was born? But with these experts

who saw the forgery at "a glance," and with these intuitive writers all things were possible. Still the puzzle spoken of by Dr. Furness existed, and it is unfortunate that the solution did not come before the death of Halliwell-Phillipps, Dr. Furnivall and Prof. Rolfe. Mr. Law should have started his investigations before these veterans had passed away. Dr. Furness is still with us and no doubt enjoys the solution.

In reading the volume of Mr. Law it appears that the recent examination of these documents has been careful, thorough and scientific. The photographic fac-simile of the two pages of the entries for 1604-5 lend interest and satisfaction, all of which might have been increased by a similar reproduction of the entries in Book XIII. One is warranted in believing that Mr. Law speaks with authority. He names those who made the investigations, and he gives their reasons and conclusions, and intuition has not supplanted the laboratory. It is not the province of the general reader or of the public to call in question the conclusions announced by the very eminent authorities who are quoted. Final decision must rest somewhere, and it is safe in their hands. Theirs was not the "glance" taken in 1868, and the following conclusions of Mr. Law seem to be fully warranted: The result of these various investigations is, the writer ventures to think, entirely to clear Peter Cunningham of the charge of forgery brought against him, and completely to remove the stigma affixed to the documents in 1868. The two play-lists, therefore, should henceforth assuredly take their place on an unshakable basis, as the most curious of all contemporary references to the performances of Shakespeare's plays at Court in his lifetime, and the most valuable intrinsic evidence we possess—with the single exception of Meres's list in his Palladis Tamia—for the sequence of their composition, and, consequent thereon, for the interpretation of that interesting psychological problem—the development of our great dramatist's mind and art." If these conclusions seem somewhat limited the advanced Shakespeare scholarship of the present time will widen them, and in so doing will be resting on a sure foundation.

The discovery of these manuscripts by Mr. Cunningham, and his peaceable possession of them for twenty-six years, is a story apart from the charges of forgery set afoot at a later day. The documents which were "glanced at" in derision in 1868 were hailed with delight in 1842. He who was denounced as a forger at the later date was a trusted clerk in the Audit Office and an honored officer of The Shakespeare Society twenty-six years before, when he recovered the papers and published them under the most respectable auspices. These documents were not printed by the official authority of the Audit Office in 1842, giving to the world a part of its official

records. No such claim was then made or such pretense then thought of. Mr. Cunningham published them as his own private property, and printed the full story of their discovery in the Introduction to his volume, and then publicly retained the possession of the original manuscripts. Every one knew where they were and they were not concealed. No demand was made by the Audit Office for their return, and no search for their location was needed. To charge larceny upon Mr. Cunningham at that time is to charge gross carelessness amounting to official criminality against the officers of the Audit Office. Against this one feels like registering a protest. Such a charge is ridiculous. These things did not take place in that way. When all the facts are understood, when the whole story is read, and especially the Introduction to Mr. Cunningham's volume of 1842, it is seen that the very best faith has been kept by every one connected with these documents, the officers of 1842, the officers of 1868, and Mr. Cunningham himself. Between these two dates great interest had been awakened in Shakesperean matters, and great animosities had been aroused against Shakespearean forgeries. This period had been the hey-day of John Payne Collier, as publisher, if he was not the forger. During this period the Shakesperean expert was born, and in 1868 he was ready to practice his profession. The articles above quoted are samples of the new workmanship. When Mr. Cunningham sent these documents to the Manuscript Department of the British Museum on April 29, 1868, he had the same property, the same possession, and the same right of possession in them which he maintained toward them in 1842; no more and no less. The intervening time had not changed the relations or affected the rights. These rights must be judged according to the conditions existing in 1842. Nothing that he could do in 1868 could fix or change the legal or official status of the documents when first recovered by him. That must be determined by his attitude and actions, and by those of the Audit Office, at that time. Mr. Cunningham's statement has never been contradicted, and no recovery of the documents was ever attempted. Mr. Cunningham's account is as follows, beginning on page XLV of his Introduction:

"The discovery of these papers sharpened my desire to discover more; and I sought in dry repositories, damp cellars, and still damper vaults, for books of account, for warrants and for receipts. I had gone by this time through the Rolls of Accounts from the reign of Henry VIII to the end of that of Charles I, but I found little in them to satisfy, and much to provoke inquiry. I was told again and again that if there were any old papers in the office of the reigns I sought for, that they were not Declared Accounts, they were there by accident, and that no Board ever recognized the existence of

official vouchers and Books of Account so far back as the reigns I referred to; while a few recollected, and all had heard of, the cart-loads of old papers burnt in Tothil Fields on the removal of the office from Whitehall to Somerset House. . . . It was at this time I had the good fortune to redeem from a destructive oblivion a bundle of the Original Accounts of the Masters of the Revels, those that Malone had sought so long for, and had seen at last by the kindness of Sir William Murgrave, an old commissioner of the Audit, and from which he had made the extracts that Boswell has printed in his edition of Shakespeare. These however left off at a time the most interesting in all our literary annals. There was as yet nothing about Shakespeare—nothing to destroy conjectures advanced by commentators that no one believed, yet no one could gainsay—the idlest of all kinds of suppositions that every fresh fact has only served to refute. . . . My last discovery was my most interesting, and alighting as I now did on two official books of the Revels—one of Tylney's and one of Buc's—which had escaped both Musgrave and Malone, I at last found something about Shakespeare—something that was new, and something that was definite. This was my little Guanahana, but there I was destined to stop, for no other books of the Revels have I as yet succeeded in finding among the scattered papers of the old Auditors of the Imprests. We owe these two to accident, and it is not too fanciful to suppose that chance may yet lead to the discovery of other books connected with Shakespeare's two and twenty years 'traffic' with the stage. I am not without hope on this subject, and that it may be my lot to find them even in the office I am now in."

This account was published on February 1, 1842, and it does not sound as though it was prepared to be used on a future occasion nearly thirty years distant. When this was printed no question as to title, possession, or right of possession had been raised, or even thought of, and no one can read these words without being impressed with the candor and absolute sincerity of the writer. If they were true, then subsequent conduct could not affect them. If the Audit Officers had for one moment thought that these documents then belonged to their files they would have seen to it that they were properly returned after publication, and if Mr. Cunningham was guilty of larceny, then these officers were guilty of negligence as to a public trust. There is not a hint in this direction, and such a charge is absurd. It appears that the charge of larceny is of much later origin; for in the first article which appeared on the subject, that in the Athenaeum of June 20, 1868, it is distinctly stated: "The gentleman who offered them for sale appears to have thought his right of property in them perfect."

Of course Mr. Cunningham's opinion in 1868 would not decide his guilt or innocence in 1842; his attitude and his conduct at that time must be determined by all the facts as they then existed. The retention of the documents by the officials when they were offered for sale in 1868 was certainly justifiable. The right of possession to such papers as these would probably not be ruled by the common law applying to ordinary personal property, but rather by that governmental right akin to eminent domain. Such documents should be preserved at all hazards, and if an injury results to a private citizen let the Government respond when a legal, equitable, or moral liability has been fixed in the usual manner. No inference can be drawn against Mr. Cunningham because of the retention of the papers by Mr. Bond or their impounding by Sir Frederick Madden.

The credit and the honor of "The Shakespeare Society" of those early years are involved in this accusation; they knew how Mr. Cunningham obtained the manuscripts, and they did not lend their sanction to the publication of ill-gotten material. Mr. Cunningham states clearly how he obtained the documents. "I was told again and again that, if there were any old papers in the office of the reigns I sought for, that they were not Declared Accounts, and no Board ever recognized the existence of official vouchers and Books of Account as far back as the reigns" of Elizabeth or James I. It is no wonder that in the last years of his life Mr. Cunningham simply said concerning these documents: "They belong to me. . . . But for me they would have been destroyed through sheer ignorance, or sold for waste paper." If the finder had "been a rich man," and had printed the documents and presented them to the nation, which was his expressed desire, no doubt they would have been accepted in the spirit in which they were offered.

The pathos of these years is swallowed up in Peter Cunningham's overwhelming vindication. A change has come to him that comes to but few. The evil charged against him is interred with his bones; the good he did in hunting through dry cellars and damp vaults, and finally finding these manuscripts in the "charcoal repository," lives after him. The list of plays he preserved is not as long as that recorded by Meres, but it ranks next in importance. To know that Othello was played in 1604, and Winter's Tale and Tempest in 1611, helps to establish a satisfactory Shakesperean chronology.

S.

MARGINALIA

AT THE FOUNDING OF THE NEW YORK SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY twenty-six years ago, one of Dr. Morgan's earliest colleagues was the Hon. Alvey Augustus Adee of Washington, D. C. And when Dr. Morgan conceived the idea of an Edition of the Plays that should avoid the barnacles of notation, but permit every student to be his own annotator by printing the text of every play precisely as Shakespeare himself saw it in the quartos, paralleled with the text as his first Editor seven years after his death (that is to say, the text of the first Quarto paralleled with the text of the first folio, every imperfection and error of the types punctilliously preserved so that every student might make up his mind whether a "crux" was Shakespeare's or his printer's) Mr. Adee suggested the unique and comprehensiv notation which that Edition adopted. He first suggested it in the elaborate and brilliant paper read before the Society, which, as apropos, especially at this time, when the question of a new system of editing Shakespeare has been agitated, we re-present to our readers in another part of this issue. In 1886 just about a year after the founding of the New York Shakespeare Society, President Cleveland commissioned Mr. Adee Second Assistant Secretary of State, and on August 3rd of this year, 1911, he completed the twenty-sixth year of his service in that office. Mr. Adee's diplomatic service really has been much longer. Before being commissioned an Assistant Secretary of State Mr. Adee was Secretary of Legation at Madrid for fifteen years, and during his service as Second Assistant Secretary of State, it is scarcely a figure of speech to say that he, in a certain sense, has long been the whole Department in epitome. His public service, extending over a period of forty-one years and covering diplomatic experience abroad as well as administrative work at home, has made him a competent and insistant authority on a thousand details which, were it necessary to go through all the red-tape processes of research, would consume weeks in digging out; for he has a phenomenal memory for names, dates, typical incidents, and items of differentiation.

We copy from the New York Evening Post a sketch of Mr. Adee, which is intimate of his characteristics: "There goes the State Department," remarked a gentleman on Pennsylvania avenue, pointing to a passing bicycle, bearing the figure of a short, wiry man in a suit of rough tweeds and a brownish felt hat. The wheelman's face was florid and deeply lined; his hair and whiskers were a mixture of auburn and gray, and his features distinctively Scotch; his eyes were not only keen, but told the close reader of physiognomy that their owner was deaf and had to depend on them for a double sense-function. The office was not created till 1866, when William Hunter was installed in it. After his death, Mr. Adee took up the work, and has filled the post ever since. It is doubtful if three men in Washington could tell under oath what political party he is partial to, or whether he was ever affiliated, even indirectly, with any. Certainly none of the eleven chiefs under whom he has worked in his present responsible capacity has taken the trouble to investigate. It has been enough for them to know that Adee was where he was.

Not only has Mr. Adee been charged with the immediate duty of keeping the administrative machinery running, using the chief clerk as his medium in directing the activities of his subordinates, but he has had to oversee the business education of secretary after secretary, who has come to the head of the department, with a brain teeming with plans and policies, perhaps, but as ignorant of diplomatic methods as a college sophomore. Then, too, he has played the part of a sieve for these men. Documents and correspondence affecting our foreign relations are prepared under his orders for submission to the secretary and the President. Domestic proclamations, telling the people of the United States what they are bound to be thankful for every November, come within his purview, though bearing signatures of higher dignity than his. Communications from foreign governments are passed over his desk, where they are appropriately annotated before final consideration by the men who are clothed with the outward responsibility for the responses sent.

Mr. Adee has been for more than a quarter of a century an indefatigable bicycle rider, using his wheel for going about the city much of the time, when other officers of corresponding dignity were dependent on carriages. When asked once how, being almost bereft of hearing, he escaped accidents on the road, he answered:

"I don't, always, but the Lord is extraordinarily kind to the afflicted." Indeed, his attitude toward his deafness has always been one of philosophic

tolerance, possibly because he has realized that it has contributed no small element to the success of his career.

The deaf man in a public position where reserve is all important, has one strong point in his favor, he may be depended upon not to be garrulous. He may be trusted, too, not to have too many confidences with others, owing to the danger of advertising his own remarks through the other party's shouted responses. But Mr. Adee has yet another infirmity which has stood him in equally good stead officially, to wit, a temper worthy of his Scottish ancestry. When it is calm, he is urbanity exemplified; when it explodes, let those who stand nearest look out for themselves! His underlings live in awe of this sort of demonstration after having witnessed one, and it makes some of them more careful with their work; while outsiders having frequent business with the department learn to avoid irritating importunities and other breaches of courtesy.

Now and then it is innocent, animate or inanimate, who suffer because the guilty are out of reach. Gossip used to have it that on one occasion, Mr. Adee entered to his room after a very annoying interview in the secretary's office, and began to scatter his books and papers this way and that, now slamming a bulky volume upon the floor, now sweeping a pile of unsigned letters into the waste-basket, and otherwise reducing the top of his writing table to a plain of desolation.

Toward the close of the outburst a messenger entered, bearing the modest luncheon Mr. Adee had ordered before going out. Its most conspicuous factor was a large piece of pie. Reaching for that as he had reached for the laws, treaties, and correspondence which he had lately sent hurtling through space, Adee flung it straight at the messenger's head. The frightened servitor dodged, and the pie shot over him, plastering itself, in all its juicy exuberance, against the portrait of a distinguished secretary of state of a past era which hung on the wall behind. What purports to be the mark of it is still pointed out, on the sly, to visitors.

There was always an apocryphal odor about this story, and I should not wish to vouch for its truth. It was told at a dinner once to a guest who was frank enough to go to Mr. Adee the next day and repeat it to him without modification in any particular, and this is the conversation as he reported it:

"Mr. Secretary, I give this merely as I heard it, but I should be glad to know whether it is true."

"Mr. Jones," replied Mc Adee, "you have probably lived long enough

to know that you cannot believe all you hear." So the question still remains unsettled in Mr. Jones' mind.

Mr. Adee's reputation as an encyclopædia of diplomatic lore, ranging all the way from the order of precedence at a state dinner to the preliminaries of a declaration of war, is common property. The late Secretary Hay once said to the writer with a chuckle:

"Mr. Adee would make a good Bible. He can begin at the creation and tell me just how everything has been done in the past, and wind up by instructing me in my duties as head of this department. And the beauty of it is that I know I shan't go far astray if I follow him."

On more than one occasion Mr. Adee has been acting secretary of state. During the absence of both Secretary and Assistant Secretary at a juncture in some of our diplomatic operations where the training of an international lawyer was highly necessary.

Mr. Adee has often, in the absences of his superior, been the real Secretary and his name is signed to the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain of 1888.

A NUMBER OF DR. MORGAN'S PERSONAL AND PROEFSSIONAL FRIENDS tendered him a congratulatory banquet upon his sixty-sixth birthday, October 2nd, 1911, Dr. Morgan was however prevented by sickness from accepting in person but sent his latest photograph, upon which he wrote the quotation:

"Paint me with every blemish," said the Lord Protector grim,
And the picture there was Cromwell, whatever the soul of him.

(We give an engraving of the photograph as frontispiece to this issue). The dinner was held nevertheless in Dr. Morgan's honor. No formal speeches were made, but B. Frank Carpenter, Ph.D., remarked that it was certainly unique that a lawyer after seventeen years at the Bar should retire from practice, after service as Counsel to two great transportation corporations, not to a life of idleness, but to work in an antiquarian field that happened to interest him, and add almost two score of volumes of original matter to the output of that field. And yet this was precisely Dr. Morgan's record. Counting the twenty volumes of The Bankside Shakespeare, and the five volumes of The Bankside Restoration Shakespeare, there are thirty-four volumes of what Dr. Morgan calls the Higher Criticism of Shakespeare to his credit. But this is not all of Dr. Morgan's work. Not counting various contributions to periodicals throughout his long professional life, and three "best sellers" which Dr. Morgan likes to forget, it appears by the

subjoined bibliography that Dr. Morgan has written many other legal and technical books. His "The People and The Railways" of thirty years ago, was widely commented upon at its date. Especially its chapters criticising the policy and economy of the Interstate Commerce Law. It is hardly remembered to-day that the chief argument in favor of this law was that it would prevent the creation of "Trade Centres" by railway discriminations in freights, etc. Dr. Morgan showed that no trade or artificial considerations ever had or ever could build up a "Trade Centre." That the trade centres of the world were where they were in the days when the only means of locomotion were by ox teams, or wains dragged by horses or bullocks, or carried along rivers. London, Paris, Antwerp, Vienna, are to-day just where they always were. Another position which Dr. Morgan took at that time was that Trusts or holding-companies instead of being against public policy were really Capitalist's Trades Unions, to offset—and properly offset—the Labor Trades Unions, and for the actual best interests of both consumer and producer, the interests of both demanding the cheapest prices that a combination so far from being a monopoly, in the old mediaeval sense, would out of self-protection cheapen the price of its product in order to prevent other Trusts from entering its particular field. And, thus, that the question was between the Trust and the Sweat-shop (as Dr. Morgan tersely put it). This is advanced ground even to-day. The following is believed to be a complete bibliography of Dr. Morgan's books:

Specimens of Macaronic Poetry. With an Introduction. New York. Hurd and Houghton. 12mo., de luxe. 1872. Pp. xx, 350.

Guaranty and Suretyship. DeGolyar. American Notes. New York. Baker, Vorhis and Co. Law, 8vo., pp. 300.

The Law of Literature. Reviewing the Laws of Literary Property in Manuscripts, Books, Lectures, Dramatic and Musical Compositions, Works of Art, Newspapers, Periodicals, etc. Copyright, Copyright Transfers, and Piracy, Libel and Contempt of Court by Literary matter, etc. With an Appendix of the American, English, French and German Statutes of Copyright. 2vo, pp. 513, 518. New York: James Cockcroft and Company. Law calf and Library cloth. Imperial, 8vo. 1875.

The Principles of Evidence. By James Best. American notes. Wv., Law, 8vo, pp. 500, 600. New York: James Cockcroft and Co. 1876.

Addision on The Law of Contract. American Notes. 3vo, pp. 500, 750. New York: James Cockcroft and Co. 1876.

Trial by Jury. A history of the Institution. By James Forsyth. American Notes and Introduction. New York: 1877. James Cockcroft and Co.

The Trial of Prof. John W. Webster for the Murder of Parkman. Introduction, Notes and Comparative Cases. Law, 8ovo., calf, pp. 66. New York: James Cockcroft and Co. 1878.

The Shakespearean Myth. William Shakespeare and Circumstantial Evidence. Cloth, 12mo., pp. xv, 342. Cincinnati: Robert Clark and Co. 1880. 2nd Ed., Sp. 1882; 3rd Ed. 1885; German Ed., 1885. Liepsig-Bröckhaus. (German Translation by Carl Müller-Mylens).

An English Version of Legal Maxims (with the original forms alphabetically arranged—an index, etc.). 12mo., Law calf, pp. 200. Cincinnati: Robert Clark and Co. 1877.

Some Shakespearean Commentators. A rejoinder to the Critics of The Shakesperean Myth. Paper, pp. 60. Cincinnati: Robert Clark and Co. 1881.

International Copyright. An address delivered before the Manhattan Literary Society. Paper, pp. 50. New York: James Cockcroft and Co. 1877.

Anglo-American International Copyright. An open Letter to Hon. William M. Evarts, Secretary of State. Paper, 12mo., New York: James Cockcroft and Co. 1878.

A Study In the Warwickshire Dialect, with a Glossary, Introductions and Notes touching the Edward the Sixth Grammar Schools, and the Elizabethan Pronunciation as deducted from the Puns in the Shakespeare Plays. And as to the Influence which may have shaped the Shakespeare vocabulary. Editions, 1885, 1886, 1890, 1891. (The first edition bore the title, "Venus and Adonis, A Study, etc."). New York and Westfield, New Jersey. The Shakespeare Society of New York. The Shakespeare Press. 12mo., Roxburghe, pp. 486.

The People and The Railways. Being a rejoinder to Hudson's "The Railways and The Republic." With an Examination of the Proposed Interstate Commerce Law. Cloth, 1w mo., pp. 300. New York: Belford Clarke and Co. 1888.

The Society and The "Fad." Being the Amplification of an Address once made before the New York City Shakespeare Club. New York: L. S. D. Hodges. Cloth, pp. 40.

Shakespeare In Fact and In Criticism. 12mo., Roxburghe, pp. 400. New York: William Evarts Benjamin. 1888.

The Bankside Shakespeare. Being the Plays of William Shakespeare, circa 1564-1608. The texts of the first Quarto edition parallelled with the text of the Heminges and Condell folio of 1623. With Critica Introduc-

tions touching the environment stage history and publications of each Play. New York: The Shakespeare Society of New York. 1885-1888. Twenty-one volumes, Roxburghe de luxe.

The Bankside-Restoration Shakespeare. Being the texts of the Shakespeare Plays in second or other Quarto parallelled with the Restored texts as re-written in the Restoration Period by Dryden, Shadwell and others. Five Vols., Roxburghe de luxe, 8vo., uniform with the Bankside Shakespeare. New York: The Shakespeare Press, Westfield, New Jersey, and New York City. 1905, 1908.

Shakespeare and Bacon. Can They Be Reconciled? A Debate with Isaac Hull Platt, M. D. New York and Westfield, New Jersey. Paper, pp. 100 plates. Quarto. 1902.

Digesta Shakespeareana. Being a Topical Index of printed matter relating to William Shakespeare and His Plays and Poems exclusive of Editions of the Text and of Aesthetic Criticism. 2v., paper, 16mo. New York: The Shakespeare Society of New York. 1885, 1887.

A History of the Family of Morgan from the year 1089 to Present times, genealogically. With Appendix carrying the Line back to Gwenned, King of All-Wales, A. D. 605. Issued in parts from 1901 to 1908. Westfield, New Jersey. The Shakespeare Press, Albany, New York. The Joseph McDonough Company.

Forty Years of Shakespearean Controversy, with account of the Geneses of the Bacon, Marlowe, Rutland, Derby and other anti-Shakespearean Authorship Theories, The Cipherists, The Shakespeare Forgers and other Interesting People. Somerville, New Jersey: The Unionist-Gazette Association. (In Press).

Books Received

371. The Vindicators of Shakespeare. A Reply to Critics. Together with some remarks on Dr. Wallace's New Shakespeare Discoveries. By G. G. Greenwood, M. P. Author of The Shakespeare Problem Re-Stated. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 230. London: Sweeting and Company.

372. Some Supposed Shakespeare Forgeries. An Examination Into the Authenticity of Certain Documents affecting the Dates of Several of the Plays. By Ernest Law, B. A., F. S. A., Barrister at Law. With fac similes of documents. Boards, sq., 12mo., pp. 23. London: George Bell and Sons.

373. Jahrbuch des Deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft Im Aufrage des Verstandes herausgeben, von Alois Brandl und Max Forster (Sebenundvierzigister Jahrgang. Cloth, 8vo., pp. 438, Mit drei bilden. Berlin-Schoneberg-Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

374. What We Know of the Elizabethian Stage. Reprinted from Modern Philology. Vol. IX. July, 1911. By G. F. Reynolds. Pamphlet, paper, pp. 35.

375. Shakespeare Bibliography: A Dictionary of Every Known Issue of the Writings of Our National Poet, and the Recorded Opinion thereon. By William Jaggard. With Historical Introduction, Fac Similie and other Illustrations and Aftermath of Additions and Corrections while printing. Quarto, Buckram, pp. 730; Stratford-on-Avon. The Shakespeare Head Press.

373. The two prominent papers in the ever-welcome Jahrbuch, are Dr. Brandl's "Zu Shakespeare's Totenmask und Ben Jonson's Totenbild," and Mr. W. J. Lawrence's "The Evolution and Influence of the Elizabethian Playhouse."

Of course there is nothing new to be said about the Kesselstadt "Death Mask." But Dr. Brandl reviews what has been said, (and especially what Dr. Wislicenus has just said in his "Shakespeare's Totenmask" which we noticed in our last issue,) with reference to Ben Jonson's superlative endorsement of the Droeshout engraving "in which the artist had a strife with Nature to outdo the life (but must have been badly worsted by Nature, one would say. For if "Nature" ever had anything to do in making such a wooden caricature on humanity as that frontispiece to the first folio presents, then her job for once must have been done vicariously by one of her journeymen. But we know that Ben Jonson was willing to say anything in rhyme, and not unwilling to say just the reverse in prose. And while we always love him as a Poet and a Dramatist, we rarely expect him to be anything else. Dr. Brandl's inspiration to re-open the question, conceding that Ben Jonson really meant what he said, is creditable and valuable. The new picture of the Death Mask (for it certainly is a Death Mask of somebody) preserves the lineaments of some phlegmatic German—gentleman, though Dr. Brandl prefers a Frenchman! In our opinion, of some German; we should have guessed that it was Bismarck had the dates been conciliatory). It must be remembered, however, that the Kesselstadt Death Mask has three points strongly in its favor as a Death Mask of Shakespeare. (1) It was found in an old Rubbish Shop. (2) It was purchased for a trifle, and (3) It had a red, or reddish hair or two adherring to its reverse. But even conceding these desiderata, and after re-summing

up all the arguments in its favor, Dr. Brandl is very emphatic in agreeing with the British Museum authorities, and in disagreeing with Dr. Wislicenus, that, and holding that in his opinion, whoever it represents, it is not a Death Mask of William Shakespeare.

371. So long as a gentleman does not think or declare that Bacon, or anybody but Shakespeare, wrote the Shakespeare Plays, he is at carte blanche to say anything that occurs to him, or that he guesses or hears guessed, concerning anything Shakespearean,—environmental, historical, biographical, or fantastic. That is about the sum and gear of Mr. Greenwood's third volume. (His Shakespeare Problem Re-Stated and his Rejoinder No. 1, having preceded his present work).

Mr. Greenwood's title, "The Vindicators of Shakespeare" is "writ sarcastic." He especially pokes fun at the dignified Sir Edward Sullivan and the Reverend Canon Beeching, both of which gentlemen have lately paid their precious compliments to Mr. Greenwood in the Nineteenth Century and After, and aims to show that their "Vindications" of Shakespeare are cruel, and that Shakespeare might well cry to them: "Let not thy precious balms break my head."

Almost any one familiar with this eternal controversy would be able to re-write all that all three of the above-named gentlemen said or say in this course: There is apparently nothing new possible.

And herein is our criticism and grievance. It is remarkable—but we suppose we must get used to it—that the Baconian Theory (however disguised, any authorship theory is "the Baconian Theory!") must be fought, over and over and over again, on precisely the same lines; within precisely the same roped-in arena—and with the same gloves as when fifty or sixty years ago the fight first began to make itslef lovely and interesting! All in vain have writers, not altogether non compos demonstrated—for at least ten years in these pages—that the Shakespeare authorship theory proposition has assumed entirely new aspects, and entire new associations to-day—that questions as to parallellisms, internal evidences, etc., have become secondary to circumstantial and exterior evidences of the publications of the material, quartos and folios, of the dates, persons engaged, and so on! But with these neither Mr. Greenwood, Canon Beeching, nor Sir dward Sullivan concern themselves. Three years ago Prof. Anders challenged all comers to present ten statements of fact that tended towards a doubt of the orthodox authorship. Mr. Sohmers (ante Vol. VII, page 55) produced not ten, but eleven facts as coincidences, no one of which could be reconciled with the orthodox propositus, and which, moreover, made such a coincidence be-

tween themselves as to constitute together the strongest coincidence of all —to the contrary. But although these were copied into "Baconiana" (our London Contemporary) and were a complete ad finem to Prof. Anders', who never attempts to answer them (except in a feeble effort at jocularity at their expense) neither of the above named gentlemen touch upon one of these eleven coincidences. We have read the entire discussion of this new Three against Thebes. And, at this distance it strikes us in array, that all three love just a trifle better to say mordant and biting things about each other, than to advance either the metier or the merits of the thing discussed. But, of course, in a fair field, the honors of the Debate are with Mr. Greenfield.

375. We still think (and perhaps more than ever) that the Digesta Shakespeareana, issued by The New York Shakespeare Society of twenty-five years ago, deserved to have been continued. As a matter of fact it was discontinued out of compliment to the admirable annual Bibliographies which the German Shakespeare Society began to issue at about that time. For it seems surplusage and waste of effort to do the same work in two forms every year. And the task of hunting for a topic in an annual list became negligible, although in a century or century and a half list, no light matter. The Digesta not only arranged titles under Topics, but indexed them by Authors, adding bibliographical details. But then also cross-referenced the Topics as to sub-Topical treatments and so gave the student his reference at once. But Mr. Jaggard, by following conventional methods in bibliography, has anyhow produced a Monument to Shakespeare—even if he has subordinated its usefulness to practical purposes to that monumental design. And this, we think, was really what Mr. Jaggard desired to raise. A Monument to Shakespeare. He has grouped thirty-six thousand titles. Has printed a limited edition, and at a price prohibitive, a l'outrance to a Student. It is therefore a Monument—to Mr. Jaggard's industry, patience and zeal, too, but chiefly to the great Dramatist. As Mr. Jaggard is a descendant of the Jaggard and Blount—Jaggard of 1623—First Folio memory—this work is also a sort of family monument as well. These thirty-six thousand entries include editions, treatises, eulogies, "esthetic" criticism (which the Digesta rejected, believing that students of the Plays usually felt equal to their own esthetic criticism, or at least valued their own opinions enough to ignore some one else's). Evertyhing touching the name Shakespeare is, we are fain to believe, here in some shape, if we only had time to hunt for it, but alas, where the Digesta carried us to what we wanted, we now devote our alloted hours to finding—and it is no entirely

bootless study either—where Mr. Jaggard tucks away this Title or that, under what group he included this favorite of ours or where he found a niche for that! We have looked in vain, for example for that parallelization of the Shakespeare with the Shakespeare Restoration Drama, provided, so far as we know, only by the New York Shakespeare Society's Bankside Restoration Series. We wonder how many hours or days it would take if a student desired to write a thesis upon the Restoration of Shakespeare in the second Caroline epoch, for him to carry references to the desired material from Mr. Jaggard's elaborate system of memorializing Shakespeare!

It were ungracious to criticise such a huge and laborious volume as this. Any criticism would sound like cavil. But it is not to cavil—but to aid in the appreciation of Mr. Jaggard's work that we suggest, in view of the inevitable supplement which he or some successor must of course issue in a few years, that there are a great many omissions numerically (though proportionately to the inclusions not so very many). Even to this volume is attached an "Aftermath," being titles of new volumes appearing during the book's passage through the press: which suggests that the really serviceable Bibliography of the Future will be a card catalogue.

Mr. Jaggard, who is a descendant of the William Jaggard who with Blount Aspley and Smithweeke—printed the first folio, supposed to have been "Edited" by Heminge and Condell (though probably those two gentlemen never even knew that their names were used for them, or if they did, had forgotten the circumstance, for they never alluded to it or did any of their friends ever allude to it)—in 1623. The Bibliography is finely printed and its 36,000 entries are as Domine Sampson would have said, "Prodigous." Mr. Jaggard tells us that he has been twenty-two years at the work. And we can well believe it. But the work is a curiosity (or, we should say, an exhibit of the world's appreciation of Shakespeare) rather than a work of reference for either student or book-seller. The one will scarcely be liable to find what will guide him expeditiously to what particular he wants, and the other will still consult his trade lists. The work is rather an addition to Shakespeareana than a Catalogue of Shakespeareana. For the latter we must still refer to the annual bibliographies issued in its invaluable Jahrbuch by our friends, The Deutches Shakespeare Gesselschaft, or beg for a reissuance of that admirable Degesta Shakesperareana. We are sure that even its almost prohibitive price will not prevent, in time, the taking up of Mr. Jaggard's five hundred copies (to which the edition is limited), and permit him to augment and issue a normally priced students' edition of the book.

The Current Drama

[In this Department only current Plays of worth and of more or less permanent interest are entered.]

Walter Browne's Modern Morality Play, "Everywoman," has achieved the success we foresaw and prophesied, besides having amply reversed the rule that meritorious Drama usually spells financial failure. The character of Everywoman is an exacting one. Than Shakespeare's Cleopatra (his one complete, many sided, many-mooded woman "Rix e pax et oscula") we know of none quite so exacting. Everywoman in the first act is the Ingenué; in the second, the Siren; in the third a Queen of the Revels; in the fourth the Penitent; and, in the fifth, the tender, loving, Woman! Whether the management will always be able to find an artist as capable as Miss Hall, who created the part and played it in New York City, we do not venture a guess. May be it is not likely. But the play will always be a lesson in early stage similitude and stage history. It is written to demand sumptuous staging, and it will be always worth an evening's while everywhere.

"Pomander Walk" is the name of a small cul de sac in a nameless little village of Acady—(somewhere near Mrs. Gaskell's Cranford, we guess)! Here the people are all neighborly and nice, and, in proper time fall in love with each other and get married in perfect Acadie fashion. The Play "Pomander Walk" has been the success of one season, and is beginning another season of other success. At Wallock's in New York City its author has produced another quite different play from "Pomander Walk." But it has the same flavor of success about it. In it Mr. George Arliss makes up for Disraeli—the name of the Play is "Disraeli"). And his work is masterly—as masterly as his make-up is perfect. It will be another success of this, and certainly—as long as Mr. Arliss plays—of seasons to come.

***The Editors cannot undertake to return unused manuscript, though they will endeavor to do so if self-directed, stamped envelope is enclosed therewith.

All manuscripts submitted *must be type-written.*

NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, P. O. Box 250, SOMERVILLE, NEW JERSEY.

Address all matters intended for The Editors, Books for Review, etc.,